

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated June 18, 2003. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Non-elected claims 14-17 have been canceled. Non-elected claim 10 has been retained since it is dependent on elected claim 8. Accordingly, if elected claim 8 is allowed claim 10 should also be allowed.

The allowance of claims 27-30 is noted with appreciation.

There are presently three independent claims which have been rejected. These are claims 1, 20 and 25. Claims 18-19 are dependent on claim 1. Claims 2-9, 12-13 and 26 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 25. In addition, non-elected claim 10 is dependent indirectly on claim 25. Claim 20 has no dependent claims.

It is respectfully submitted that parent claim 25 and its dependent claims are patentable over the prior art and particularly over Chase. In the last Office Action claim 25 was rejected as anticipated by Chase.

Claim 25 as now amended clearly distinguishes over Chase whether taken alone or whether modified alone or whether modified in view of other prior art. As now amended claim 25 relates to a cleaning assembly which includes two components. One of the components is a flexible cover and the other is a wipe. Claim 25

defines the flexible cover as being of sheet-like form and having end sections which are interconnected by a central section. Fastening structure on the end sections detachably secure the end sections together at spaced locations with an open area therebetween to form a closed loop enclosure having a top and a bottom and sides between the top and the bottom. The fastening structure is located at the top of the enclosure diametrically remote from the central section of the cover which is located at the bottom of the enclosure. Because the end sections are detachably connected together they may be detached from each other so that the top is open thereby permitting a cleaning head of a cleaning implement to be inserted through the open top of the enclosure. The cover then envelopes the cleaning head when the end sections are secured together. In this secured condition the longitudinal sides of the enclosure are open. The cover also includes reusable mounting structure located so that the wipe can be detachably secured to the reusable mounting structure to mount the wipe at the central section at the bottom of the enclosure. In order to accomplish this the reusable mounting structure could be located at the central section itself as disclosed, for example, in Figures 2 and 4. Claim 25, however, is drafted to permit the reusable mounting structure to actually be located on the sides upwardly from the central section which would still make possible having the wipe secured across the central section by being mounted

at spaced locations above the central section. Thus, in use the wipe would be attached to the reusable mounting structure so that the wipe is at and across the central section at the bottom of the enclosure. Before the wipe is mounted to the cover or when the wipe is later removed from the cover, the central section at the bottom of the enclosure and the reusable mounting structure become exposed.

It is noted that newly added claim 31 points out that the wipe itself has complementary mounting structure for engaging the reusable mounting structure of the cover and that the complementary mounting structure is also removed when the wipe is detached. Note is also made that claim 6 which is dependent on claim 5 has been amended to point out that the spaced flaps extend longitudinally outwardly from the top.

It is respectfully submitted that Chase does not disclose, suggest or make obvious the invention defined in parent claim 25. As defined therein the cleaning attachment is directed to the type of structure generally illustrated in Figures 2-9 where the cover is a flexible member of sheet-like form having opposite free ends so that when the cover is folded around the cleaning head of a cleaning implement, the ends of the cover are attached together forming a closed loop type enclosure having a top and a bottom and having interconnected sides. In this closed loop condition the longitudinal edges of the sides remain free of attachment to each

other thereby resulting in the edges being capable of being spaced from each other. Instead, the attachment is achieved by fastening structure on the end sections. Initially, the cover attachment would be enclosed around the cleaning head. The cover attachment has reusable mounting structure located so that when it is intended to use the cleaning implement as a mop, a wipe would be secured to the reusable mounting structure with the wipe then being located at and across the central section at the bottom of the enclosure remote from the top of the enclosure. The implement would then be used wherein the wipe performs the cleaning function. When desired the wipe could then be removed from the cleaning attachment and either replaced by a new wipe or if there is still "life" in the original wipe the original wipe could be reattached across the bottom of the enclosure.

The dry mop of Chase to the extent it has any similarity to what is disclosed in the present application is actually more similar to the non-elected embodiment of Figures 10-11. As Chase states the embodiment "comprises a casing or bag-like member 1, consisting of a fabric sheet folded upon itself and secured together along its sides and folded edge by a row of stitching 3 which not only unites the lower edges of a sheet of blanks or plies 5, but also permanently secures the plies to the casing 1". (Page 1, lines 20-27) Thus, what is shown and described in Chase does not include an enclosure having longitudinal side edges which are open

and spaced from each other and does not include detachably mounted plies which could be removed and, if desired, later reattached.

Chase actually shows two different embodiments, each of which significantly differs from the present invention. In the embodiment best illustrated in Figure 3 the plies 5 are permanently secured to the casing and thus are not detachable and reattachable. Moreover, the plies extend only partially across the bottom of the casing and broom cleaning head. In the Figure 10 embodiment the casing includes spaced buttons 20. The lower end of the plies are bound together by a row of stitching 22 passing through a binding tape 23. See Figures 8-9. The bound end has spaced slots or buttonholes 24 to attach the plies as a unit to the casing. As shown in Figure 10 the buttons 20 and binding tape 23 are located along a side of the casing and not across the bottom - - in fact, not even partially across the bottom as is the case in Figure 4 of Chase. Where the plies are of textile fabric they are bound together so that individual sheets can not be separated. Where the plies are made of an inexpensive material, such as paper, the lower edges are perforated at 25 so that individual plies can be separated. See Figure 8. A separated ply, however, can not be reattached.

Examiner Cole has been quite thorough in her explanation of how she believed that Chase anticipated the prior claims as set forth in her Office Action. It is requested that in accordance

with her thoroughness Examiner Cole should carefully compare claim 25 with the disclosure in Chase and particularly with regard to the two specific embodiments of Chase. Such comparison will make clear that Chase does not anticipate, suggest or in anyway make obvious the invention of parent claim 25.

Various dependent claims which were dependent on claim 25 were rejected as unpatentable over Chase in view of Green. Green, however, does not overcome the deficiencies of Chase. Thus, Green does not disclose a sheet-like cover which is folded to form an enclosure having open side edges and having a wipe detachably attached across the bottom of the cover.

Other prior art relied upon in combination with Chase includes Semenchuk which likewise does not overcome the deficiencies of Chase. Semenchuk relates to a curling broom intended to be used in a sports activity rather than as a cleaning implement. The combinability of Semenchuk with Chase is therefore disputed since both patents have such diverse end purposes. But, even if such combination were made, the resultant hypothetical combination would not be the same as claim 25.

The Von Post and Barry patents which were also relied upon as secondary references in rejecting different dependent claims likewise do not overcome the deficiencies of Chase.


It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as now amended, is also patentable over Chase whether taken alone or in view of other

prior art. Claim 1 includes many of the same distinctions discussed above with regard to claim 25 such as the cover being of sheet-like form having side edges which are spaced from each other and having the detachably mounted wipe located across the central section at the bottom of the closed loop and wherein the wipe can be detached which would expose the central section and the reusable mounting structure.

It is similarly submitted that independent claim 20 is likewise patentable over Chase whether taken alone or in view of other prior art. Independent claim 20 is similar to claim 1 and in addition includes the feature of the wipe being impregnated with a cleaning composition.

In view of the above remarks and amendments it is submitted that this application should be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Harold Pezzner, Esquire
Reg. No. 22,112
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz, LLP
1220 Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 658-9141

:::ODMA\MHODMA\CB;283557;1